

**Remarks**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated January 29, 2003. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 7-10, 16-18, and 19-36 were pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims.

**Specification**

The Office Action objected to the disclosure due to several informalities. Applicants amend the specification in order to correct the informalities noted by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

**Section 103 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects Claims 7-10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,699,523 issued to *Li et al.* (hereinafter "*Li*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,231,633 issued to *Hluchyj* (hereinafter "*Hluchyj*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Li* in view of *Hluchyj* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,179,708 issued to *Gyllstrom et al.* (hereinafter "*Gyllstrom*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejection and the determinations and assertions therein.

Independent Claim 7 recites, in part, "determining at the server a current client rotation position of the client". Neither *Li*, *Hluchyj*, or *Gyllstrom*, alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or disclose at least this element of Claim 7. For example, in *Hluchyj*, packets are routed by traffic type – not "a current client rotation position of the client" as recited by Claim 7. See *Hluchyj*, FIG. 5; *id.*, c. 5:43-7:58. For at least these reasons, Claim 7 is patentable. Independent Claims 16, 24, and 32 are patentable for reasons analogous to Claim 7. Claims 8-10, 17-23, 25-31, and 33-36 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and as defining further distinctions over the cited patent. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 7-10, 16-18, and 19-36.

**Conclusion**

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 7-10, 16-18, and 19-36.

Although Applicants believe that no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
~~Attorneys for Applicants~~

Terry J. Stalford  
Reg. No. 39,522

Date: June 27, 2003

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
Phone: 214-953-6477  
Fax: 214-661-4477

Customer Number or Bar Code Label:

